ndia

FOR THE

ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1898.

[REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER. | PRICE...... 2D. BY POST, 2½D.

mittee on Currency: Offer dian Evidence Declined ... 26
ew with Mr. Dadabhai Nao- 26
Lord Elgin's Administration, by Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E.... 21
The Trans-frontier Question Re-opened, by an Anglo-Indian ... 23
Our London Letter 24
Chronicle of the Week 25
Letter to the Editor: The "True" and the "False" Rupee 26
Plague Measures in Bombay: Conviction of an English Soldier for Criminal Assault 27
Dr. Mullick at the Pioneer Club ... 28
"India Office Superlatives" 28
India in Parliament 29
Et Caetera 30
Advertisements 31-32

NOTES AND NEWS.

MR. ARTHUR STRAUSS, M.P., the Liberal Unionist member for the Camborne division of Cornwall, remarked in the House of Commons on June 27, in the course of the debate on the new Loan Bill, that the "fairness and business capacity" of Sir Henry Fowler "commanded the admiration of everyone." "But," Mr. Strauss added, amid laughter, "unfortunately he (that is, Sir Henry Fowler) did not always act up to his convictions, or he would be sitting on the Ministerial side of the House." How far Mr. Strauss's opinion upon this point is shared by members on either side of the House of Commons, we do not profess to know. But, so far at least as Indian questions are concerned, we have more than once had to express the view that, if there was a pin to choose between the present Secretary of State and his predecessor, Lord George Hamilton was to be preferred on account of the far less vehemence and persuasiveness with which he defends the same reactionary propositions. It is possible, of course, that Sir Henry Fowler regards remarks like Mr. Strauss's as a tribute to his own judicial impartiality. But some of us cannot help thinking that there is a difference between judicial impartiality and flat Toryism. What, for example, is one to make of this sentence, which Sir H. Fowler uttered in his speech on the Loan Bill?

I was amused just now (he said) by my hon. friend behind me when he referred to Warren Hastings and Lord Clive, and intimated that the present Viceroy should not have the same meed of honour awarded to him in respect of the *mens æqua in arduis* as has been awarded to them. I may suggest that if Lord Clive and Warren Hastings had had their proceedings discussed in this House on frequent occasions, and if those proceedings had been made the subject of Parliamentary enquiries, we should possibly not have had an Indian Empire.

The "hon. friend behind" Sir Henry Fowler was Mr. Pickersgill, who had ventured to observe that Lord G. Hamilton "had spoken of Lord Elgin, who was an amiable and no doubt able man, in terms of eulogy which were only appropriate to a Warren Hastings or a Lord Clive." The opinion of the Anglo-Indian *Pioneer* upon the same point will be found in the interesting article, "India Office Superlatives," which we reproduce on another page. Now, what in the world was the relevance to this point of Sir Henry Fowler's sneer at Parliamentary discussion and enquiry? Is it suggested that Parliamentary discussion and enquiry are *ardua* to which the *mens æqua* of Lord Elgin, less fortunate than Lord Clive and Warren Hastings, has alone been subjected? A more absurdly unhistorical proposition it would be difficult to conceive. Were the proceedings of Lord Clive and Warren Hastings not the subject of Parliamentary discussion? Was not Parliamentary enquiry the rule in the days of the East India Company? Has Sir Henry Fowler never heard of the great Parliamentary enquiry of 1772—five years after Clive had finally left India, and two years before Warren Hastings became Governor-General? Has he not heard of the Parliamentary enquiries which preceded each renewal of the East India Company's Charter up to 1853? Sir Courtenay Ilbert, in the historical introduction to his "Government of India," points out that the "main stages" of the period from 1760 to 1858 "are marked by Acts of Parliament occurring with one exception at regular intervals of twenty years"—that is to say, following the Parliamentary "stock-taking" upon which each renewal of the charter was conditional. Sir Henry Fowler's suggestion is at once so irrelevant and so unhistorical as to create the impression that it was intended to be a mere gibe at the expense of the authority of Parliament in Indian affairs.

We search in vain for any shred of proof that "we should possibly not have had an Indian Empire" if the proceedings of Clive and Warren Hastings had been the subject of frequent Parliamentary discussion and enquiry. But we may go further, and carry the war for a moment into Sir Henry Fowler's territory. For surely it is demonstrable that, if we have an Indian Empire, it is precisely because up to 1858 the administration of Englishmen in India *was* regularly subjected to Parliamentary discussion and enquiry. It is not merely that the great reforms in Anglo-Indian administration which made and maintained our Indian Empire followed step by step upon the "stock-takings" that recurred automatically as the charter expired. Every official in India knew also that the "stock-taking" was always approaching, and he had a wholesome apprehension of the day when he would be called upon to give an account of his stewardship. For forty years—that is, since the transference of the powers of the Company to the Crown—no such "stock-taking" has been held, and much of what is deplorable in British India to-day is manifestly the result of this negligence; is due, in other words, to causes which Parliament, if it looked seriously into the matter, would promptly remove. Nor is that all. When the Company was supreme, prominent politicians in England were able to see that patriotism and self-respect bade them scrutinise fearlessly, on behalf of the Indian taxpayer, the work of a trading monopoly. But now that the Government of India is virtually an arm of the Imperial Government, that salutary temper has passed away, and the tendency of the Front Benches is rather to think that patriotism and dignity require the systematic concealment and condonation of anything untoward in the administration of India. This sneer of Sir H. Fowler's at the part which Parliament plays or might play in Indian affairs is, it seems to us, highly significant.

The writer of the Parliamentary sketch in the *Daily Chronicle* of Saturday last, described the Lord Chancellor as saying, in the previous day's debate in the House of Lords on the Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill:—

In some parts of India brothers and sisters married, and we did not interfere; were we to recognise the offspring of such marriages in our law?

This is a hard saying. So far, at any rate, as the great mass of the Indian population is concerned—we mean the Hindus and the Mahometans—the statement is certainly inaccurate. Their "prohibited degrees" are, in fact, far more stringent than our own. It is possible, of course, that the Lord Chancellor, as head of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which is the highest court of appeal in Indian cases, has had to do with the marriage customs of some out-of-the-way Indian race which have escaped the notice even of distinguished Indian lawyers. But, so far as we can ascertain, there is not the least ground for the very grave statement which is here attributed to the Lord Chancellor. We are inclined to think that the Lord Chancellor has been misreported, as it is proverbially difficult to hear what is said by speakers in the House of Lords, and we have not found any trace of the passage in any other newspaper.

Sir M. E. Grant Duff delivered an address to his old constituents at Elgin on July 11. An ex-Governor of Madras, he naturally touched on Indian affairs; and on the recent North-West policy he said this:—

The Afghan war . . . . cost some twenty millions, effected nothing

worth effecting at all, and has left a legacy of mischief of which we are far from having seen the end. All that we have done since we departed from the wise policy of Lord Lawrence on the North-West frontier has been a mistake. Some of the steps on the downward road have been made inevitable by previous steps. That I do not deny, but the whole policy from the first has been radically unsound. One of its many bad effects has been the recent war, which has certainly not redounded to the credit of our statesmen, although it has brought deserved honour to many officers and privates, not least to our Native auxiliaries. The meaning of the whole series of disastrous blunders which have been made since, twenty years ago, in defiance of all the best opinions, we advanced to Quetta, is simply this, that the soldiers at Simla captured the civilians, and made more than one Viceroy the prey of their bow and of their spear. I cannot blame the soldiers; they looked at the matter from a purely professional point of view. . . . But I do blame Viceroys, who had no such excuse.

Referring to the causes of the war just concluded, Sir M. E. Grant Duff gave some little weight to Mussulman fanaticism. "But," he added, "if our own fatuous 'forward policy' had not teased and excited the tribes, the fanatics would not have had material on which to work." Has Sir M. E. Grant Duff been studying INDIA? In any case, he summarises points that we have been laboriously trying to drive into the heads of our countrymen. But, interesting as all this is in retrospect, what was Sir M. E. Grant Duff doing when the "fatuous" policy was being urged into execution? Surely then was the time to speak out. The historical judgment is welcome enough; but far more welcome would have been a practical protest when a protest was needed, especially from men of Indian experience in high office. Only Sir M. E. Grant Duff has, we fancy, always been more a spectator and historical critic than a man of action. Even the Front Opposition Bench does not appear to have the least notion of the chance it has missed.

It is the belief of many excellent though simple-minded persons that we have gained at least one solid result by the vast expenditure of blood and treasure in the war beyond the North-West frontier. But they little know the tribesman. A good rifle is the last thing he would think of parting with; and in view of the prevalence of blood-feuds this is hardly to be wondered at. It is true that, in accordance with the proclamation, a very considerable number of weapons have been given in at Jamrud; but these are in great part made up out of old barrels, which had been already broken into two or three pieces and sold as scrap-iron. And in default of better, these have to be accepted. The *Pioneer* tells a story of one of the tribesmen offering Rs. 600, an immense sum of money to him, for permission to keep his weapon, which shows the value they set on their rifles. But not only are they very reluctant to give up those they possess, they have even hopes of getting new supplies from the manufactory at Kabul. The disarmament of the tribes is a hopeless task; and if they were disarmed, they would probably, many of them, starve. The frontier problem has been indefinitely complicated by the recent unhappy campaign.

When judge and jury differ in India Anglo-Indians invariably assume that the judge is right and the jury wrong; and as the jury is in these cases usually for acquittal and the judge for conviction, juries are held up to odium as encouraging crime and impeding the due course of justice. Happily the High Court of Madras has no fixed opinion of this kind. At Kistna, in a recent trial of sixteen prisoners for dacoity, the jury acquitted them all, but the acting sessions judge, Mr. Michael, refused to accept the verdict, except as to five, and referred the case against the other eleven to the High Court. But their lordships, so far from upholding the judge, declared that the evidence against the accused would not warrant a conviction. It is surely unnecessary, when judge and jury differ, as happens in other places besides India, to impute bad motives to either, and still less to draw inferences unfavourable to either institution.

Mr. Lister, the sub-divisional magistrate of Sewan, recently undertook the investigation of a charge of homicide against the servants of two zemindars, men who are both held in much respect by their neighbours. He held a local enquiry in their house, accosting one with the words, "You are concealing yourself after killing a man"; he afterwards ordered him to be brought on foot to the house of the murdered man's son, and then kept him standing in the sun for an hour and a-half. Then, when the accuse[d] ...
sessions, i...
the two zei...
and while ...
other in pri...
the deputy m...
a rule of the ...
Mr. Lister re...
announcing this; ...
much longer than ...

The *Amrita Bazar* ...

The Honourable Chief ...
he heard from Mr. Jackson, ...
joint magistrate of Sarun. ...
remarks on the conduct of M...
exaggeration in the story of the petitioners, there was no doubt that the application of the petitioners had been dealt with in a somewhat arbitrary manner by the magistrate. It seemed to his lordship that there was at least slight bias on the part of the magistrate against the petitioners, and he had allowed that bias to outstrip that judicial impartiality which every magistrate ought to exercise. His lordship deprecated the method adopted in this case by the magistrate, of trying a case himself which he had investigated. He considered it injudicious on the part of the magistrate to force evidence in this case when his attention was drawn to the fact that a rule *nisi* was issued by the High Court for the transfer of the case to some other magistrate. "The magistrates ought to know," concluded his lordship, "that when once a rule is issued by this court that they stay their hands, they should abide loyally to the orders of this court."

It must be painful to Lord George Hamilton, if he reads this, to see so high a judicial authority speaking thus of one who is engaged in "civilising savages." We shall, however, watch Mr. Lister's future career with interest.

It might be thought that the terrible tragedy at Barrackpur—the murder of Dr. Sircar—which has so deeply impressed the people of India, would at least for a time have produced some improvement in the conduct of the British soldiers at that place. Yet the *Bengalee* tells us on the authority of a well-known man, Suresh Chander Samajpati, that on Sunday, June 5, near Barrackpur station, some European soldiers not only took a basket of mangoes from a boy, but thrashed a coolie who had the temerity to remonstrate. How long is this kind of thing to go on? And what steps are the responsible authorities taking to prevent it?

The *Pioneer*, in an article headed "Feet of Clay," draws attention to the inefficiency, corruption, and tyranny of many of the subordinate officials in India, and for remedy proposes (1) an increase of salary, and (2) the formation of an enlightened public opinion to condemn and resist the guilty. But how can either of these remedies be applied? How can the salaries of the Native officials be increased as long as India is oppressed by the high salaries of the Anglo-Indian officials and by the drain to England? How can an enlightened public opinion be formed, when those who would be its natural leaders are flouted at every turn, treated as seditious if they claim a share in the government of their native country, and as disloyal if they venture to say that everything is not for the best under the best of all possible governments? It is absurd to appeal to "Indian patriots" to regenerate Indian opinion while at the same time everything is done to keep Indians from sharing in the higher functions of government, and while the mass of Anglo-Indians treat them with an ill-disguised contempt.

Those who have followed the discussion in the *Pioneer* as to whether India is growing richer will have been struck by one point which Mr. Nundy brings out. Mr. Morrison says that five-sixths of the people are three times as well off now as they were fifty years ago. If the people were as well off two hundred years ago as they are now, why cannot we raise eighty millions of revenue like Aurungzebe? If they are three times as well off, why cannot we raise two hundred and forty millions of revenue? Is it pretended that the most cruel and tyrannical Government could now raise such a revenue, or anything like it in India? Meantime Mr. Beck has been engaged in giving away his own case, for he now says that the indebtedness of the peasantry is a recognised evil. How can the peasantry be growing richer if they are getting more into debt? And how can India prosper if her agriculturists, 70 per cent. of the population, are growing poorer?

The *Madras Standard* publishes the full text of the inaugural address of Mr. K. Perraju, President of the

Fourth Godavery District Confere[...]e land settlement system of the Province. The add[...]s is worthy of the attention of Indian administrators. Mr. Perraju points out that as early as 1856 the Government of Madras in their Administration Report declared that "under the rayatwari system every registered holder of land is recognised as its proprietor and pays direct to Government. He cannot be ejected by Government so long as he pays the fixed assessment." In the following year the Board of Revenue declared that "a Madras rayat is able to retain his land in perpetuity without any increase of assessment as long as he continues to fulfil his engagements."

The subject received the attention of able and eminent statesmen like Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, and Lord Northbrook, until finally Lord Ripon organised a modified system of permanent settlement. It was declared under this system that the assessment in all adequately assessed districts was permanent and unalterable in respect of classification of soils and calculation of grain out-turns, and was only subject to revision on the ground of rise in prices. Mr. Perraju declares that this sound decision and pledge has now been withdrawn, and the present policy of the Madras Government is to enhance rents either with reference to rise in prices, or in reference to the re-classification of soils and re-calculation of grain returns. He adds that as a matter of fact 70 per cent. of the soil has been re-classified as alluvial, and the revenue has been increased by 12 lakhs.

These are serious matters which, we repeat, deserve the attention of statesmen. The frequent evictions of Madras tenants is often the subject of questions in the House of Commons, and the cause of these evictions should be closely looked into. In Bengal, the position of the cultivator has been strengthened by every succeeding land Act, viz., by the Acts of 1859, 1868, and 1884. Is it a fact that in Madras, where the State is the landlord, the position of the cultivator has been weakened by the policy adopted in recent years? Is it a fact that the fixed assessment of 1856 was converted into an assessment liable to enhancement on the ground of rise in prices in 1880-84, and has thus again been converted into an assessment liable to enhancement on the ground of re-classification of soils? We ask for information. Poor cultivators in India have their vested rights like other classes of men, and a pledge once given to them should not be lightly withdrawn.

The proposal in the Madras Tenancy Bill to empower District Collectors (instead of the civil courts) to dispose of rent suits is a mistake, and has rightly been condemned, as we learn from the *Hindu*, by the Chief Justice of Madras. "I altogether demur," he is reported to have said, "to the proposition to give the collector the general jurisdiction conferred on him by the Bill and to make the Board of Revenue a court of final appeal. The Bengal precedent is against it." The tendency of the present Government is, we fear, to lower the judiciary in India and, by concentrating power in the hands of the executive, to render a despotic form of Government more despotic. The policy is not only unworthy of a progressive Government, but also most unwise in the present instance. In Bengal, the decisions of civil courts in rent cases give universal satisfaction. Why should Madras be treated like backward provinces and districts where alone the collector is the rent judge?

The provision of the Central Provinces Tenancy Bill which withdraws from occupancy and ordinary rayats the right of transferring holdings is to be regretted. The alleged purpose is to protect them from their own indiscretion, especially in selling their holdings to money-lenders. Yet in the greater part of Bengal the cultivators virtually enjoy the right of transfer, and do not sell their holdings to money-lenders. Why should it be otherwise in the Central Provinces? Are we to suppose that the difference is that in Bengal the land revenue is permanently settled, while in the Central Provinces it is enhanced at each recurring settlement? The Bengal rayat is prosperous; the Central Provinces rayat is indebted and distressed. Having brought the cultivators to poverty and indebtedness, the Government, it seems, would prevent them from finding relief by sale of holdings. It is like pinching a child and stopping its mouth when it begins to cry.

The *Tribune* of Lahore has a notable series of articles on "Native Princes of the New School." It was not the object of the Queen-Empress's Government to place the Native Princes of India under surveillance by appointing European residents to their Courts, but nevertheless this is said to be what often happens. "If the Resident or Political Officer happens to be inconsiderate, haughty, and exacting, he can make the life of a Native Prince miserable and an intolerable burden. Humiliation after humiliation is put on him till he longs to exchange his position with the lowest among his subjects." Under such a régime, a Native Prince may well lose interest in the administration of his State; "he plays, gambles, drinks, goes on the turf, and is never so happy as when surrounded by a few Anglo-Indians of doubtful character." Undue restraint has a demoralising influence. But restraint and coercion are at present the methods which find favour among those connected with Indian administration.

The other day, Mr. C. W. Whish, I.C.S., read a very important paper on the "Necessity and Possibility of Reform in the Police Administration of India," before the East India Association in London. Mr. Whish, while acknowledging the vast benefits of British administration, asserted that it "is carried out by means which produce, at times, an almost unbearable amount of irritation in the country." He referred especially to "the network of subordinate officialism" and to the police; and he even thought "that the discontent and unrest of which we have heard so much lately in India are due to conditions of this nature, which might be largely ameliorated by judicious reform." The effect of the Special Police Commission, he said, "at least in the part of India which I know, has been, so far as regards the people, absolutely *nil*." He evidently does not believe that the investigation has ever gone below the deceptive surface. He considered three reforms only: the enlargement of the areas of independent administration, the abolition of statistical tests, and the substitution of prevention for detection of crime. These three reforms appear to Mr. Whish "to be not only most urgently required, but also to present a prospect of practical realisation."

In abolishing the Plague Committee of Bombay the Bombay Government has, we think, acted justly and wisely, but it would seem that the great powers of that Committee have been transferred not to the Municipal Corporation, but to the Municipal Commissioner. Mr. Mehta explains the thing with his usual clearness when he says: "Under the new plan the Commissioner is the head of the Committee, absolutely under the control of the Government, but independent of the Corporation, and he would be entitled as such to spend any amount of money from the municipal treasury by the orders of Government." This is amazing. But a larger question remains apparently still undecided—should the large expenses incurred at Bombay and Poona be charged to the afflicted population of those towns? Should not the Imperial exchequer of India come to their aid in such a crisis?

The *Hindi Punch* has more than one excellent cartoon on the subject of the plague expenditure in Bombay. One is a tablet "Sacred to the memory of 33½ lacs" spent by the Plague Committee, with the following significant words below: "The Bombay Plague Committee, after an existence of fifteen months, silently passed away on the 6th of June last, having spent during its life-time Rs. 33,50,000 from the Municipal Exchequer, etc." A second cartoon represents Miss Bombay enquiring into the reason of her impoverishment, and the Municipal Corporation replying: "The plague, ma'm. But if you will just allow me to pick the pocket of the general ratepayer, and to pinch the half-starved poor, the thing may be done!" Below is the remark that the Corporation has "proposed to increase the general tax and the town duty on grain" to tide over the financial difficulty. We ask again, is it not cruelty to the plague-stricken population to charge them with the cost of the relief measures and thus add to their sufferings?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AS THE "DEFENDER" OF THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT.

IN consequence of the small space allotted to Lord George Hamilton's speeches by the *Times* and other London newspapers, few have had an opportunity of reading his remarks on India in the address he delivered to his constituents on June 29. They will be found, however, in the columns of the *Middlesex County Times* of July 2, and they are reproduced here because they are characteristic of the speaker and of his method of "defending" the Government of India. Here is the passage:—

If he turned to the department for which he was responsible—India—he thought they might congratulate themselves and the Indian Government on successfully surmounting plague, famine, war and sedition. There was one thing he was not good tempered about. He did not care for personal attacks upon himself, as he had been long enough in politics to know the exact value of personalities of that character: but he could not stand the attacks made upon their fellow-countrymen in positions of tremendous responsibility, who, at great risk to their lives, were striving to maintain the prestige of the British flag. If their Empire abroad was extending to an immeasurably greater extent than that of any other country, one of the main reasons of that advance and progress was that there were any number of young men, who, at any moment when they were called upon, were ready to go to a savage, foreign country, taking their lives in their hands, and by force of character and foresight they were enabled in an immeasurably short time to establish humanity and civilised order. These men were entitled to their respect and their consideration, and if they heard that under the most trying circumstances they had committed an error of judgment, or had done something which upon reflection seemed better not to have been done, still they should take into consideration the extreme difficulties which surrounded them, and they should be thankful they were able to obtain such a body of young gentlemen ever ready to maintain the prestige of England at the risk of their lives, and to bring about the extension of the Empire in all parts of the world.

It will thus be seen that Lord George Hamilton claims a respectful consideration for Anglo-Indian officials because of the dangers they run in extending the empire and in civilising savage countries. Now it will naturally be asked, What has this glorious extension of empire to do with the Indian Government? How does it touch the Indian Civil Service? Is it pretended that this is their chief duty; that the true sphere of their labours is beyond the North-West frontier; and that any errors committed throughout India are to be condoned because of the great services rendered in civilising the Afridis? Or does he mean that the great deeds done by Englishmen in Africa throw such a halo of glory over their countrymen in India as to wipe out all offences? But if neither of these meanings be his, how can the extension of the empire affect our judgment on the actions of the Indian Government? Again, Lord George Hamilton tells us, as an answer to troublesome and seditious critics, of the number of young Englishmen—or should it be "young gentlemen"?—who are ready to go to a "savage foreign country" to establish civilised order. Does this mean that India is a savage country which is only becoming civilised by the efforts of the English—India, which presented an aspect of ordered civilisation to the soldiers of Alexander the Great, the contemporary of Aristotle; a civilisation which was already ancient when the ancestors of the English were still nomads, and which has endured unbroken to the present day? The people of India have their faults, like other peoples; but who ever, before this, thought of them as savages? And yet if India be not one of the savage countries to which the Secretary of State refers, how does the readiness of young Englishmen to go to savage countries help the case of the English in India? How is it an answer to attacks—whether well or ill founded—on abuses in India to point to what Englishmen have done on the Niger or the Nile? Either Lord George Hamilton believes that India is a savage country or he can only defend the doings of the English in India by turning attention to what they have done in Africa, which, whether it be good or bad, is beside the question. We pity the Indian Government and the Indian Civil Service if they have to rely on such a defender.

But even supposing this line of defence were as strongly supported, as it is really contradicted, by facts—even supposing Anglo-Indian officials were engaged in civilising savages at the hazard of their lives—could we regard this as a just and sufficient answer to specific charges of error or misconduct? The Indians have always been ready and more than ready to acknowledge the services of those men who, in [torn] ...ying themselves with the country they had to rule, [torn] ...ve endeared themselves to all by their justice and sympathy. But on what grounds is the good conduct of some to blot out the misconduct of others? How, for example, are arbitrary imprisonment and reckless finance to be condoned on the ground that their authors, or some colleagues and subordinates of their authors, are ready to sacrifice their lives in civilising the savage inhabitants of Benares or Madras? Calling evidence to character is usually the last resort of the criminal who is unable directly to rebut the charges against him. But what would be thought of the defence which consisted in calling evidence, not as to the defendant's character, but as to that of his companions and servants? Yet this, it would appear, is the defence offered by Lord George Hamilton.

And even if this difficulty be got over, even if it be granted that the virtues of the Civil Service—and we have never had anything but admiration for its great merits—are sufficient to cover many faults in the system of Indian Government, yet it cannot be admitted that the debt of gratitude India owes to it is as enormous as its defenders insist. The members of that service have, indeed, to live in a foreign country, but for that, as the Indian Treasury feels, they receive a high salary. They have to spend some time in an unhealthy climate, but in most cases not so much at the risk of their lives as of their livers; and they, happily, in general, survive to pass many years in their native country on a handsome pension. If we compare this state of things either with the lot of English officials in tropical Africa or with that of civil servants at home, we see that the Indian Service has its advantages. On the West Coast of Africa the official with smaller pay and prospects has to fear an infinitely worse climate. At home the civil servant pays for the great blessing of remaining in his native land by drawing a much smaller salary, by remaining many more years at work, and by retiring at last on what is by comparison an insignificant pension. Why, then, is the Anglo-Indian civil servant to be singled out for especial gratitude—gratitude of such an all-embracing kind that it falls alike on the just and the unjust, that it covers all follies and condones all crimes? At home, the civil servant receives the honour due to all citizens who worthily fulfil their appointed task in the commonwealth. To this the Indian civil servant is entitled. Why is he to receive more? Is it because he is, as Lord George Hamilton puts it, civilising savages? Is it because the ancient peoples of India are an inferior race, to live and work among whom is a great condescension? Surely, it is an absurdity to speak of the Anglo-Indians, so well paid out of India's poverty, as if their kindness in consenting to govern that savage country were such as to excuse all mistakes and all delinquencies. They serve for a great price. Have not the Indians even the right to examine their service?

As we have already said, the extract which we have quoted from Lord George Hamilton's speech is characteristic of the man, and is in perfect harmony with his conduct throughout his connexion with the office he now holds. Throughout he has consistently used the officials in India as a buffer and shield to protect himself. Is the policy of the Government attacked, Lord George declares that the honour of the Civil Service is impugned. Is the Government convicted of an error of judgment, he descants on the services and the good record of the Anglo-Indian officials. It is well known that numbers of the most able and experienced civilians in India are bitterly opposed to the policy of frontier extension, and thoroughly distrust the military clique that has so much weight at Simla, but the Secretary of State continues to sustain a policy of military extravagance by praising the heroism of the English race and treating the most temperate criticism as vile defamation of patriotic heroes. Lord George tells us he cannot stand attacks on his fellow-countrymen in India, while all the time he is defending himself by pretending that his critics are aiming at his subordinates. His views seem to have the advantage of simplicity. It is sedition to state a grievance against a civilian. It is the blackest ingratitude towards the whole Civil Service, if not towards the whole English race, to state a grievance against the Secretary of State. These ridiculous outbursts of temper are the cloak of something perilously like treachery. Lord George Hamilton, while pretending to defend the Indian Government, is too often engaged in

passing on to them the responsibility which really belongs to himself. It is time the public estimated his righteous indignation at its true worth. And this, we fancy, the public is beginning to do.

ANCIENT WESTERN CIVILISATION.[1]

NO one can read Dr. Cunningham's "Western Civilisation" and remain under the delusion that Political Economy is necessarily a "dismal science," even when it deals with remote ages and countries. The charm of the book is its living interest. We are made to feel that history is "philosophy teaching by example"—by examples that have their direct application to the politics of to-day. Even from a civilisation so remote and so obscure as that of ancient Phoenicia, Dr. Cunningham extorts its lesson. The lesson in this particular case, by the way, is interesting as showing how different is the standpoint of the modern political economist from his predecessor of half-a-century ago, how vastly he has gained in width of outlook and in "humanity," how much he has learnt from extending his view beyond the limits of his own country and generation. Phoenicia, according to Dr. Cunningham, indicates by its rapid decay the concealed weakness of any great civilisation built upon the fluctuating basis of trade. It also shows that free commercial intercourse is not always as beneficial to all concerned as we are apt to assume. The Phoenicians worked out the minerals and drained the population of less civilised lands to accumulate wealth at Tyre; the effect of their commerce was to exhaust, not to enrich. The great superiority of the Greeks over the Phoenicians lay in their "clear consciousness" of the distinction "between mere material prosperity and the personal self-development or political greatness for which wealth provides the means." Most true; but would a political economist of fifty years ago have emphasised the fact as strongly as Dr. Cunningham does in his contrast between Greek colonies and Phoenician trading factories? But though the modern economist can stop to admire, as his predecessors would hardly have done, the Hellenic ideal, "the glorification of cultivated human intercourse," he is able to show that his science played its own very important part in the growth of that civilisation and in its too rapid decay. It was because the Athenians had taken an important step in economic progress by becoming habituated to the use of money that they had leisure to work out their ideals of political and social life. Nothing could be more admirable than the clearness with which Dr. Cunningham shows the aid which the use of money gives to the freedom and intellectual development of the individual—a lesson to be borne in mind if ever Socialistic proposals for abolishing money come to be seriously discussed. Again, it was the unproductive expenditure of the age of Pericles that accelerated the fall of Athens. By part of that expenditure, the economically unremunerative outlay on public buildings and statuary, all succeeding generations have gained; but that is no reason for not looking the economic facts in the face.

Passing on to Alexander's empire, Dr. Cunningham shows how "the city," whilst ceasing to be adequate as a centre of political and military life, retained its importance as a centre of economic life. "The history of Greek economic development gives us in a nutshell, as it were, the history of the world; there is seen the transition from natural to money economy, and the growth or modification of the three chief types of social organisation under monetary conditions. . . . . No entirely new type of social organisation has been created; the household, the city, and to a certain extent the empire—each with its own economic side—lay within the experience of the Greeks; and to-day we have not outlived them." The deep sense of our indebtedness to the Greeks is always with Dr. Cunningham. "Just as all roads served to lead to Rome in the days of its Empire, so," he says in one place, "we find, in investigating the origins of our varied life in modern Christendom, that all lines of enquiry take us back to Greece." He is evidently of Sir Henry Maine's opinion that "except the blind forces of Nature nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin." He recurs to this theme in his last chapter, when treating of the services rendered to the world by the Greeks of Constantinople. Their obvious contribution, the diffusion of Greek literature which followed the fall of Constantinople, and led to the revival of learning in the West, has never been forgotten. But it may well be that we have not fully remembered or appreciated the fact that this final service was only the culmination of a process that had been going on for centuries. Such civilisation as had reached the West by roundabout paths had come originally from Constantinople. "The Arabs originated little or nothing; they acquired much, they carried it with them, and they were the agents of its redistribution through Western Europe. But their science was Greek, their medicine was Greek, their philosophy was Greek." Again, when we acknowledge the debt of modern Europe to imperial Rome, we are apt to forget how much Rome inherited from Greece—not merely in the days when captured Greece took her conqueror captive, but in the earlier days when Greek colonies diffused civilisation in Italy.

From the economic history of Rome, Dr. Cunningham draws several practical lessons for our own time. The maladministration of the provinces under the Republic is adduced to refute the notion that unrestricted freedom for capitalists necessarily results in the well-being of the community. "It is only under very special conditions, including the existence of a strong government to exercise a constant control, that free play for the formation of associations of capitalists bent on securing profit is anything but a public danger." Among the causes of the decay of the Roman Empire are two that have a bearing on current controversies and problems. First, the closing of fields of legitimate individual ambition must be reckoned with in legislation of a Socialistic tendency. Secondly, the ruin of the Empire was accelerated by a cause operative at the present time in so many European countries and in our own government of India—the increasing pressure of public taxation. No more useful lesson could be imposed upon light-hearted administrators than a study of the phenomena that mark the decline and fall of Rome.

A word on one point of detail may be added before we take leave of an interesting and valuable book. Dr. Cunningham follows Curtius in attributing to the Delphic Oracle great influence in Greek colonisation. Curtius's theory rests on very slender evidence. It seems more reasonable to adopt the sceptical view of Holm, who regards the Oracle as exercising in colonisation just as much or as little influence as in war. Its approval was desired; that is all. There is truth as well as humour in Holm's comparison of the well-known oracle in Herodotus to the notice on a modern prospectus that "an early application for shares is necessary to avoid disappointment."

[1] "An Essay on Western Civilisation in its Economic Aspects" (Ancient Times). By W. Cunningham, D.D. Cambridge Historical Series. Cambridge: University Press.

LORD ELGIN'S ADMINISTRATION.

By Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E.
(Late Officiating Commissioner of Orissa; sometime Member of the Legislative Council of Bengal.)

OVER four years ago the people of India heard with unfeigned satisfaction of the appointment of Lord Elgin as Viceroy and Governor-General of India. His predecessors, Lords Dufferin and Lansdowne, were able and estimable Viceroys, but had pursued a policy of annexation beyond the natural frontiers of India which had drained the resources of the country and starved the internal administration. In violation of the spirit of the gracious pledge given by the Queen to the people of India in 1858, trans-frontier expeditions and conquests had been undertaken, and charged to Indian revenues. Lord Dufferin had conquered Burma for England and for the extension of English trade, and the cost of the conquest, which has been put down at about ten millions sterling, was charged to India. Lord Lansdowne had, under the dominating influence of Lord Roberts, spent Indian revenues ceaselessly in expeditions and virtual annexations beyond the North-Western frontiers of India, which were equally a violiation of the spirit of the pledge given by the Queen to the people of India. Burma and Chitral, portions of Afghanistan and Baluchistan, are now comprehended within the "external frontiers of India" in order to justify the expenditure of revenues in these countries which are strictly outside India, and were

considered outside India when the Queen's pledge was given. The ingenious but somewhat ignoble trick of calling by the name of "India" all the Asiatic countries which it is sought to annex with India's revenues does not justify the real violation of a solemn promise. It is paltering with the people of India in a double sense—keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope.

The appointment of Lord Elgin was hailed with satisfaction. His father had ruled in India, after Lord Canning, with ability and justice, and the people of India ever cherish grateful recollections of a just and generous ruler. They hoped and believed that Lord Elgin would tread in the footsteps of his father; and they also hoped and believed that a Liberal Viceroy would turn away from ambitious and unjust annexations to improve the internal administration of India as Lord Ripon had done. The first impressions which Lord Elgin created were in keeping with the hopes entertained. Gracious in his manner and presence, kindly in his dealings with the people, quiet and practical and even retiring in his ways of work, he was believed to have all the needful virtues of a good administrator. Nor was this belief unfounded. If Lord Elgin had only been blessed with adequate strength to resist the dominating influences of the "military mandarins" and the "civil mandarins" under him in India, and the repressive mandates of Lord George Hamilton, he would have left a reputation for good and benevolent administration. But he lacked the strength to combat the influences around him; and his administration will be remembered in India as one of the most unhappy and ill-starred since the Empire of India passed from the East India Company to the Crown. Sir Henry Fowler and Lord George Hamilton have done their best to sing a chorus of praise for the retiring Viceroy. But history does not always accept the verdict of political friends and partisans. History judges the rulers of India by the sentiments and feelings of the Indian people.

The first plain indication which Lord Elgin gave of his inability to combat the dominating influences of his "mandarins" was in reference to Chitral. To the people of India the decision of the Viceroy of India and of the Government at home to retain Chitral and hold the post at the expense of Indian revenues, came as a shock and a revelation. The people of India are not consulted in respect of such measures of policy; but they can feel, and they can judge. And when it was announced that Chitral was to be retained out of the revenues of India, the people felt that the new Liberal Viceroy had, like his predecessors, sacrificed the interests of India to the insane military policy which his predecessors had pursued to the impoverishment of Indian resources.

One incident may be mentioned here to show how general and widespread this feeling was. Bengal is annually afflicted after the rains with a malarial fever, caused by defective drainage, which carries away thousands of people and prostrates millions. While the Viceregal Council was considering the Chitral question, the Bengal Legislative Council was engaged with a Bill for improving the drainage of the country where it was most defective. On the desirability of the measure there was no difference of opinion; but while the official members of the Council thought that the cost of the drainage operations should be mainly raised by voluntary taxation, the non-official members thought the money should come from the Provincial or Imperial Exchequer. As a member of the Bengal Council I then took the official view, and voted that the people should tax themselves to improve the drainage of the country. Immediately after this, the retention of Chitral was announced, and the educated people of Bengal commented bitterly on the fact that while the Government of India could not contribute money to save millions of its subjects suffering annually from malaria, the Government could throw money across the frontier for retaining absurd positions. It is needless to say that the law we passed about improving drainage has remained a dead letter; the people cannot tax themselves further. But the money which has been annually and uselessly spent in Chitral since 1895 might have, by this time, improved the drainage of half of Bengal, and saved millions of her Majesty's Indian subjects from annual sufferings and prostration worse than death.

Disasters and misfortunes thickened in India, and the inability of Lord Elgin to hold the helm of State firmly in stormy weather became more and more manifest. It is not Lord Elgin's fault that the dark shadow of a widespread famine fell over the land in 1896. But a stronger Viceroy than Lord Elgin would have stopped the enhancement of rents in the Central Provinces and in Orissa during the famine; and would also have checked that recurring revision and enhancement of rents at every new settlement which is really impoverishing the people of India. It is not Lord Elgin's fault that a plague, unprecedented in India at least within historic times, half depopulated large towns like Poona and Bombay. But a stronger ruler than Lord Elgin would have checked those measures of house-to-house search with the aid of soldiers from the barracks, which tortured the people of Poona and infuriated those of Bombay into rioting and disturbance. So far from controlling his subordinates, Lord Elgin has been like soft clay in their hands. He has been moulded and shaped according to their sweet will, and though one of the gentlest of men, he will leave behind him in India a dark record of unjust and coercive measures unparalleled within the forty years of the Queen's rule in India.

Of these measures it is scarcely necessary to speak in detail, as they are in everyone's mouth. The amazing record of coercive acts in the Bombay Presidency will be remembered with regret for many a long year in India and in England. The deportation of the Natu brothers under misapprehension and panic, and their confinement for many months after that misapprehension was thoroughly exposed, is a humiliating commentary on British justice. The unwise prosecution of petty newspapers, and the savage sentences passed in some of these cases, are an equally humiliating reflection on the coolness and courage of British administrators. Lastly, the new Sedition Laws which Lord Elgin allowed his legal adviser to pass, might well be chapters from a Russian code of laws, compiled for Nihilists. Those who saw Lord Elgin during the debates upon these Bills in Council could not help noticing his helplessness amidst his stronger subordinates. The Legal Member tried to connect the disturbance of Jula Musalmans in Bombay with writings in newspapers, and Lord Elgin had not a word to say against this outrageous argument, which later enquiries have proved to be unfounded. The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal considered it good taste and wise statesmanship to quote poetry in Council in order to hurl insult and indignity on a loyal and law-abiding nation and its representatives, and Lord Elgin was unable to call him to order and enforce decorum. Seldom has the Viceregal Council witnessed such an exhibition of feebleness in its President. Seldom has that august Council given birth to such Acts as the new Sedition Laws for India. It has been well said that under the new circular of the Russian Minister of the Interior agitators have no chance in Russia. If there is proof against them they are convicted and sentenced. If there is no proof against them, they are not convicted but nevertheless sentenced. The position of an Indian editor under the new Sedition Law is somewhat similar. If a specific offence is proved against the editor, he may be sent to gaol with hard labour under the Penal Code. If no specific offence is proved against him, he may still be sent to gaol with hard labour under the Criminal Procedure Code. Such are the laws which responsible British rulers have forged for the people of India, after India has been nearly a century and a half under British rule.

While such has been the record of Lord Elgin's internal administration, the Frontier War came upon him as a not undeserved punishment for his reckless and unjust policy in Chitral. Of the success or failure of the military expedition against the Afridis I do not now wish to speak. But the strongest supporters of the Indian Government speak of that expedition with bated breath. The military authorities collected an army larger than that with which Wellington won Waterloo. They devastated the Afridi country, burnt villages, and cut down fruit trees. And then, after an immense loss of valuable lives, European and Indian, they cleared out of the country.

But the strangest incident happened when the cost of the war came to be paid. According to strict justice, and according to the precedent of 1881, England ought to have borne a part of the expenses of the war; and if there is any one man to whom the people of India look up for the protection of their interests in such a matter, it is to the Viceroy. Yet it was Lord Elgin himself who wired to the

Secretary of State for India that India ... from England—needed none in a year of war and pestilence, and famine. On the strength of this telegram the whole cost of the frontier war was charged to the revenues of India. And within six months after this the English nation contributed nearly a million to Egypt for the Egyptian frontier war. It would be unfair to Lord Elgin to charge him with this cruel injustice to India—for it is nothing less than that. Yet his strongest supporters cannot deny that he allowed, without demur, and without a manly protest, the whole cost of the Afridi war to be charged to India, and that he was feeble enough to assent to this explicitly by the ever memorable telegram which he sent to the Secretary of State to say that India needed no help.

Weakness in a Viceroy of India is almost a sin, and this has been the besetting sin of Lord Elgin's administration. In financial matters Lord Elgin has been under the dominating influence of Sir James Westland, an Indian civilian who gives the most roseate pictures of Indian finances and yet recommends measures which the most hard-pressed financier in Europe would hesitate to adopt. It was on his calculations that Lord Elgin wired that India could do without England's contribution towards the expenses of the frontier war, and before six months were over ten millions were added to India's permanent debt! It is Sir James Westland who has at last sprung upon us that proposal for the adoption of a gold standard for India which has been received with alarm and ridicule in financial circles in Europe. To add to the value of the rupee artificially means a scarcely veiled addition to the general taxation of India, an addition to the pay and perquisites of all officials who are paid in rupees, and an addition to the indebtedness of the millions of agriculturists who are in debt. With the cold disregard for the interests and welfare of the people of India which has characterised the present Administration, all these considerations are brushed aside, and this strange proposal is made for the easy adjustment of the Indian Budget, after a wasteful expenditure of the resources of India never equalled since the days of Lord Lytton.

Such are the net results of Lord Elgin's Indian administration. With every desire to be just and even generous, with every private virtue which makes a man loved, respected and esteemed in society, Lord Elgin has failed in almost every great problem which he has had to face in India. He has failed because he never had the strength to combat those perverse and dominating influences which "military mandarins" and "civil mandarins" always exert in India over a feeble and irresolute Viceroy. He has failed because he never had the strength to resist the reactionary and repressive policy dictated to him by Lord George Hamilton. And the chorus of praise sounded by Lord George Hamilton and Sir Henry Fowler will not disguise the fact from the future historian of India that among all the dark periods of British rule in India since the abolition of the East India Company, there was never a darker period for coercive measures and repressive legislation than the term of Lord Elgin's Indian administration.

A PURIFYING FIRE:

THE TRANS-FRONTIER QUESTION RE-OPENED.

By an Anglo-Indian.

"BEHOLD how great a matter a little fire kindleth" —when combustibles are lying about. In this instance the spark was applied by that judicious and cautious statesman, Sir Henry Fowler. It was done quite incidentally, partly by way of debating flourishes in course of his speech on going into Committee on the India Loan Bill. This is how the match was applied:—

> One word about the war on [no: beyond] the North-West frontier. The House has pronounced its judgment on the policy of that war, and I congratulate the Government that the war has terminated. I think, however, that the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down [J. M. Maclean] deserve the attention of the noble lord. I do think, now that the war is over and that the country has recognised the bravery, the courage, the endurance, and the self-denial of our soldiers, there should be an investigation by the noble lord, or some one on his behalf, into all the circumstances under which that unfortunate war was commenced. (Hear, hear.) I think the noble lord would do the best thing in the interest of India if he had a rigid ... rcumstances which caused the specific outbreak ... nd also an enquiry which would at once set at re... anonymous stories which are floating about, ... ought to be properly and officially answered as to many of the details of that campaign.

It will be seen that here are three issues raised; and, in view of the re-lighting in India of the whole trans-frontier question, it is of peculiar importance to keep these issues clear in the order of the less, more, and greatest permanent political moment.

1. Under Sir Henry's loose expressions, "anonymous stories," and "many of the details of the campaign," it is the separate expedition into Tirah and the Maidan region—its necessity or otherwise, that is, "its conception"; also in less degree the skill or mistakes of commanding and other officers.

2. The abandonment of (not the specific outbreak in) the Khyber Pass in August last.

3. An investigation into "all the circumstances under which that unfortunate war was commenced"—an ill-defined phrase; but it must be interpreted to mean either (*a*) the expedition against the Afghan tribes who attacked Chakdara and the Malakand on the Chitral road; or (*b*) the invasion of Waziristan in 1894, following on the Durand-Kabul Treaty in 1893—though this later series of aggressions beyond the frontier, in anticipation of that baneful bargain, really began in 1890 under Lord Lansdowne in Lord Cross's time.

There is also to be considered a more extended and strictly historical meaning which applies to that comprehensive phrase "all the circumstances under which that unfortunate war was commenced." This extension of the proposed investigation might not be in the ex-Secretary of India's mind at the moment—less so, in that such "rigid enquiry," if ever entered on, may be highly inconvenient for Sir Henry. But we have set out the issues as above because that is in accordance with the direction in which the re-lighting has already run in India, or that it must follow if the fire is to be of the purifying sort—destroying the "hay, wood, and stubble" of the excuses, pretences, and clap-trap Viceregal and other speeches, amidst which have been systematically obscured the real bearings of the revolutionary aggressions beyond the Indian frontier since 1876.

Now let us revert to the comparatively limited current issues which, raised in mild debating form by Sir Henry Fowler, have since run up and down India, until, as regards this one dominating factor of Indian politico-military policy, "the fire is on the hills." Here it is needful to take note of two or three dates. That broad suggestion by the ex-Secretary of State of three-fold enquiry was telegraphed out to India, though, as it appears, imperfectly. But it sufficed for the Indian Press to follow the train until the full report which went out in these columns and other journals under date of June 10. By June 28 these three issues had been, in divers proportions, matter for lively illuminations in the Anglo-Indian and Indian journals of every degree. So that the combustibles were ready for the grand explosion on June 28 in the guarded paradise of the Simla United Service Institution. The lines on which the "catherine wheels" and "flying serpents" then burst into sudden blaze were clearly indicated in India of July 1 (p. 402). That conflagration amidst the Olympians was promptly responded to by bonfires and beacon-lights throughout the Indian Press, as we learned from the somewhat grieved semi-official telegram that appeared in the *Times* on July 4. Thus the little spark, kindled under an impulse of independent freedom by Sir Henry Fowler, has evoked healthy illumination; so that all the journals of our Indian Empire are counting on his acting up to his demand for "legal enquiry," and hailing him as a Daniel come to judgment. Therefore, let him gird up his loins to this important task.

Here let me take note of certain incidents that followed the application of the torch amongst the Olympians by the manful Mr. Thorburn. The amazement of the select official circle at this courageous proceeding by a sensible and independent Civilian had evidently caused uneasiness at the headquarters of the trans-frontier conspirators in Charles Street. For the telegram of July 3 raises the question whether the servants of the Indian Government should be permitted to debate political questions in public; and it was alleged that the Secretary of State at once sent

out enquiries or orders on the subject. ... new gagging policy has a fresh field ... higher game to fly at than poor verna... ...ir Edwin Collen, who presided, specially refrained fro... ing into the debate, but he took occasion to describe Mr. Thorburn's protest against the abandonment of the Khyber as an "inflammatory speech." And Sir W. Mackworth Young, the new ruler of the Punjab, "deplored the contentious tone of the discussion"—as much as to say, "no fireworks here." Sir Charles Nairne, the acting Commander-in-Chief, had, it seems, written out a speech—which he withheld, though it was *ad rem* to the paper read—in which he sought to vindicate the military reputation of the late General Yeatman-Bigg.

Thus it will be seen this is one of the instances in which the "unexpected happens"; and it is our business, as that of every true friend of the Indian Empire, to do our best to turn the incident to account. The Indian Press must do its part to whichever of the three issues the bias of each journal may direct its fire; and, thus, from divers motives and impulses all this large and still emergent question will be raised—shall the military operations and political meddling of the Indian Government, prompted or ill-restrained by the responsible authorities here, be firmly kept within the true, natural, and statutory frontiers of her Majesty's Indian possessions? Every real interest, alike of England and of India—finance, social and industrial progress, in fact, the civilisation of the great peninsula—hangs upon this.

Let me now very briefly comment on the three issues, though this journal has for years past afforded ample material for covering the whole field of this important subject.[1] Take (1) the Tirah campaign: the disputes as to the conduct of that misdirected enterprise are mainly personal, and at best strategical. Here, in passing, may be noted that the new magazine, the *Koh-i-Nor*, has an admirable and exhaustive paper, evidently done by skilled military hands, which leaves scarcely anything more to be said on the central controversy of the Dargai actions. It is not the "conduct" of this campaign that is the vital issue; it is, as poor Havelock-Allan rightly said, "the conception" of that superfluous, costly, and destructive undertaking that is matter for serious reflection and permanent lessons. As to (2) the abandonment of the Khyber, that is in some aspects one of wider scope, for which the Supreme Executive at the time must answer. The dismay and indignation which then prevailed afford the only tangible excuse for the Tirah campaign; and there is the former question, how come that abandonment to be deemed necessary even on military grounds? But these and similar details, large though they may be, open into (3) the one comprehensive subject of "all the circumstances under which that unfortunate war was commenced." The one direct proximate cause was the reckless resolve of the Salisbury-Hamilton Ministry to retain Chitral and renew the fortified road to it through the Swat and Bajour countries. But this phrase, "all the circumstances," goes much further back. It includes the fatal Durand-Kabul agreement with its sequence of demarcation and aggressions on the Afghan tribal territory. And the first definitive departure on that portentous undertaking was the invasion of Waziristan in 1894. The "rigid enquiry" into that "circumstance" must disclose who and what authorities, here or in India, were specially responsible for that disastrous renewal of aggressions beyond the border. The result will show what Ministry permitted that cardinal error; also what members of the Council of India connived at the virtual suppression of the wise and timely Dissents recorded by the three Civilian Members (the brains) of the Supreme Executive of the day, and what Secretary of State it was who kept those important State papers from the knowledge of his Cabinet colleagues. Yes, "rigid enquiry" by all means into "all the circumstances under which that unfortunate war was commenced." History is continuous and sequent: and it cannot be cut off into compartments.

---

[1] Apart from papers by the late Mr. Dacosta and others of INDIA's contributors who have closely followed the trans-frontier policy since its inception, reference should be made by those who really desire to understand the current and again pressing aspects of the subject to the issue of April 22, pp. 252-3. There will be found the *Pioneer's* vivisection of Lord Roberts's great oration to his peers on March 8, which also comprises a tolerably full survey of the shams and fallacies that baneful policy has proceeded from, first to last.

... LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

It is not often that I write upon the doings of the House of Lords, because as a rule all the interest of Parliament, such as it is, centres in what is termed the Lower House. I mean to deal chiefly with the Lords this week, not only because the Commons has been dull almost beyond precedent, but also because the Lords have on two occasions been really interesting. Let me take last Friday for instance. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal of Glencoe, a resounding title for a man whose name is Donald Smith, moved the second reading of the Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill. Lord Strathcona is the High Commissioner for Canada, and is naturally interested in the affairs of that great dependency. It will be difficult to make anyone not fully acquainted with British methods and customs and prejudices understand the necessity for this Bill. In Great Britain marriage with a deceased wife's sister is illegal. In the Colonies it is not. On the contrary such a marriage is in strict accord with the law, a law which has received the sanction of the Crown.

It would be bad and scandalous enough in these circumstances if the children of these legal marriages were reckoned illegitimate for all purposes in this country. But what happens is even worse. By some senseless arrangement of the law of inheritance, these children can succeed in this country to the personalty and chattels of their parents by right of birth, but are not allowed to inherit realty. Thus they would be entitled to property on a lease of 999 years, but not to freehold. One would have supposed that it would be sufficient just to point this out in order to have it put right. But no! The Bill was strenuously opposed by the Lord Chancellor. He said the Colonies had no right to dictate to us how to alter our law of inheritance. I should have been surprised at such narrow intolerance had I not been made acquainted with Lord Halsbury's methods when the plea for an appeal in the Tilak case was argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. After his performance there nothing would surprise me. Nor can I pretend to be surprised at the fact that about a dozen bishops came to the House to vote against this appeal for simple justice. They were true to themselves and to their order. The case was, however, too bad even for the Tory House of Lords, and the second reading of the Bill was carried by 129 to 46. With the bishops went Lord Salisbury, but not a few of his friends went the other way.

The Prince of Wales came down specially to vote for the Bill. He has always been a steadfast friend of the deceased wife's sister. With him was his son-in-law the Duke of Fife, also the Duke of Westminster, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord James of Hereford, Lord Dunraven, and some other staunch Unionists. Lord Halifax, I should say, said a word or two in the debate. As he is an extremely High Churchman, everyone expected him to denounce the object of the Bill relentlessly as an accursed thing. But he astonished all, and apparently none more than Lord Salisbury, by suggesting that a Royal Commission should enquire into the matter. Lord Salisbury shook his head in dissent and shook his sides with laughter. He was by no means enamoured of the proposal, having had enough Royal Commissions at present.

So much for one scene in the Lords. I was there again on Tuesday, being attracted by a notice on the paper which showed that the Archbishop of Canterbury was going to ask the Duke of Devonshire by what authority Sir John Gorst had said that the Bible was better taught in the Board Schools in large towns than in the Voluntary Schools. I think I have already explained in this column that Sir John Gorst's speech had given the utmost offence in Church and Tory circles. I expect it was the horrible truth of the statement which made it sting. When I reached the House I found them droning about some uninteresting preliminary business, while the Archbishop, looking grim as usual, sat in his corner, and the Duke of Devonshire yawned the celebrated Cavendish yawn. But a more interesting figure was there, for Sir John Gorst sat crouching on the steps of the throne, in the space reserved for Privy Councillors, looking comically like a prisoner who "feels his position acutely."

At length the Archbishop's turn came, and he put his question and made his complaint. He protested that the

Vice-President could not know in which schools there is the better religious instruction, for the inspectors do not examine in that subject. It was too bad, he said, that they should be criticised when there could be no ground for the criticism, and he wound up by hinting that Sir John Gorst would do well to mind his own business. Nothing hurries the Duke of Devonshire. When the Archbishop had finished it really appeared at first as if no one was going to say anything. After a pause, the Duke dragged himself to the Table. Unlike Lord Salisbury when questioned about Mr. Chamberlain's speech, the Duke had brought a copy of his colleague's remarks with him, remarks which he said "were really not very aggressive or irritating." On the religious education point of the matter the Duke did not appear either to know or to care much. He brushed it aside as a comparatively small affair, which bored him horribly.

But it will be remembered that the daring Sir John had not only girded at the Church, but had also raised his heel against the landed gentry and had blasphemed the squire and the farmer. Indeed, it only required that he should have attacked the publican to make his record of iniquity complete. But even Sir John Gorst draws the line somewhere, and he dare not lay a profane hand on that Ark of the British Constitution, the beer barrel. Now, I noticed that directly the Duke of Devonshire approached this part which reflected upon the squire, his manner altered. Hitherto he had been mildly defending his subordinate. Now he threw him over altogether. These irreverent references to the squire, which were too much for the Duke, had been taken from the report of an inspector. "I regret," observed the Duke of Devonshire in his gruff bass voice, "that assertions of so wide and sweeping a character should have been made by an official, and that they should have been repeated by the Vice-President. The statement is absolutely incapable of proof, and is untrue. No class has done more for elementary education than the country gentlemen."

I was afraid it was all going to end there, but I was pleasantly undeceived when Lord Londonderry rose. He is a noble lord with an appallingly exaggerated belief in himself, and a fine blue-blooded contempt for nearly everyone else. He began with some savage remarks about its being well for Sir John Gorst that he had so chivalrous a chief as the Duke of Devonshire. Then he went on to say that no speech of recent date had given such pain to the best friends of the Government as that of Sir John Gorst. I should have said that the Duke of Devonshire remarked more than once that Sir John's words expressed his own opinion only and were in no way official or authoritative. Lord Londonderry fastened on this. Again and again he asked what right Sir John had to express his own opinions. He was a mere Under-Secretary and ought to know his place. Is there to be no discipline? he shouted. Sir John, as Vice-President, should be merely the mouthpiece of the Lord President. "I consider his references to the squire and the farmer a gratuitous insult," continued the angry Marquis, "and I am glad that the Duke apologised for that part of the speech, otherwise the Prime Minister might not find the squire and the farmer on his side at the next election." Then, harking back to his old grievance, Lord Londonderry said, "How far are these under-secretaries to go? How are we to know when they speak for themselves and when they express the opinions of their superiors? They are only under-secretaries after all, whatever they may call themselves."

Lord Salisbury laughed with unconcealed amusement at all this. I expect he was thinking that it was absurd to make such a fuss at a little difference of opinion between Sir John Gorst and the Duke of Devonshire, when much larger splits exist behind the scenes. And I have dwelt on this matter at considerable length because, after all, real interest in the world of politics just now centres in the squabbling and rivalries and hostilities within the Great United Party. Here is another minor sign of it. On Friday, when I left the House, Lord Arthur Hill was on duty as a whip in the Lobby, as he has been any time during the last thirteen years. The first thing I heard in the House on Monday was a motion for a writ for an election owing to the fact that Lord Arthur had resigned. He has confessed in an interview that he has had enough of it. I have no doubt he has, for he has been shabbily treated by his party. It is notorious that he wanted to go to Jamaica as Governor. It is also well known that he has desired other colonial appointments, and I think he is in every way fitted to fill such appointments with dignity and credit. Why has he, so old and valuable a servant to his party, been overlooked? Simply because he would not bow at the shrine of Chamberlain. And this is known in the Unionist party and increases the discontent and ill-will, amounting to hatred, felt in connexion with the predominance of the Chamberlain clique.

Another vacancy occurred between last Friday and Monday. It was occasioned by the very sad, nay tragic death of my friend Mr. Thomas Owen, member for the Launceston Division of Cornwall, who was accidentally drowned on Sunday in Wales. He was a very quiet, retiring man, who never spoke in the House; but he was a man of fine and sterling character. More than once he talked over Indian topics with me, and seemed oppressed with the responsibility of taking part in the government of so huge a dependency. How few of them feel so!

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, July 7.—The Old Age Pensions Committee issued their report, to the effect that none of the proposed schemes was practicable.

The Madrid feeling in favour of peace did not appear to have been strengthened by the latest disaster. The Government felt a difficulty in the fact that the troops in Cuba might be exasperated by being deprived of their chance of retrieving some of the lost fortunes of Spain. General Blanco issued a proclamation urging the loyal Cuban population to hold out to the end. President M'Kinley issued a proclamation recommending thanksgiving for the American successes in Manila Bay and at Santiago, and prayers for the protection of the United States forces. Lieutenant Hobson and the rest of the "Merrimac's" crew were exchanged; they were received in the American lines with the wildest enthusiasm. In the Philippines the native rebel leader declared the existence of the Philippine Republic. He asserted that he could take Manila whenever he chose to attack.

The adoption by the United States Senate of the Hawaii annexation resolution was regarded by the New York correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* as indicating the beginning of a policy of American expansion.

Russia threatened to seize a province in China "as compensation" if the Northern Extension Railway was persisted in. M. Pavloff had already notified the Tsung-li-Yamen to this effect.

The Porte protested against and seemed inclined to disregard the temporary settlement recently arranged in Crete by Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy.

In the French Chamber there was some discussion of the Dreyfus affair. M. Cavaignac, the Minister for War, affirmed his conviction of the prisoner's guilt and read documents tending to prove it, but said nothing about his having been legally condemned. The speech was received with enthusiasm.

FRIDAY, July 8.—A Commercial Education Conference was held at the Guildhall by the London Chamber of Commerce. Sir John Gorst, in a speech to the delegates, who came from all parts of the country, said it would not do to rely too much upon faith in the innate superiority of Englishmen and Scotsmen; they must be educated as well as their competitors were if they were not to be left behind. Special instruction was what the conference was called to consider, but it must be remembered that, unless elementary education was sound and thorough, specialisation would be of little use.

Professor Koch, undaunted by the failure of some of his "cures," delivered in Berlin an address on the bubonic plague. Three centres where the disease was always raging and whence it was conveyed to other parts of the world had been known hitherto. Dr. Koch claimed to have discovered a fourth in East Africa, close to the Victoria Nyanza. He showed how largely the plague was spread abroad by rats.

SATURDAY, July 9.—According to news from American sources, the Spanish Government, through General Toral, offered to surrender Santiago on condition that the Spanish forces should be allowed to march out. This was declined, and an unconditional surrender was insisted upon, with the alternative of bombardment at once. In Spain the feeling that peace must be made grew stronger, though it had still to contend with many warlike influences.

The Madrid correspondent of the *Daily News* telegraphed that the Cabinet now realised that the continuation of the war in Cuba would prove impracticable, since the destruction of Cervera's squadron made it impossible to land munitions of war and provisions for the troops. Should Santiago capitulate, therefore, it was believed that the Government would ask for an armistice in order to try to arrange terms of peace.

Lord Rosebery unveiled a memorial to Edmund Burke in the Church of St. Mary and All Saints, Beaconsfield, where the

great orator's body lies. Lord Rosebery referred to Burke as the greatest of Irishmen, and mentioned the fact, as throwing an interesting light on an extraordinary character, that the man whose eloquence was the delight of his country, whose writings created an impulse such as no other political writings had done, was wont to waste his time, as some would have thought, compounding rhubarb with other disagreeable adjuncts into remedies for his poorer neighbours.

Russia was now stated to have abandoned her opposition to the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank's Northern Railway Extension scheme.

Monday, July 11.—The Spanish Cabinet was said to have resigned. Differences of opinion upon the question of opening peace negotiations existed among the Ministers and prevented them from continuing to act together. At Santiago the position of the besiegers and besieged remained much the same. There was some interchange of shots on land and the fleet fired some shells, but no effective bombardment had yet taken place. Admiral Cervera was interviewed by the *New York Herald*. Besides giving particulars of various events of the war in which he had taken part, he hinted that the big guns which the "Cristobal Colon" so sorely needed had been kept back to benefit the pockets of some official in Spain.

A crowded and influential meeting, convened by Mrs. Basil Wilberforce to consider what steps could be taken to protect match girls from the horrors of "phossy-jaw," was held in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster Abbey, Canon Wilberforce in the chair. On the motion of the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, seconded by the Duchess of Sutherland, a resolution for the formation of a committee to watch over the interests of women engaged in dangerous trades was adopted, and it was also decided that a deputation should wait upon the Home Secretary to urge the necessity of legislation prohibiting the use of yellow phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

Lord Arthur Hill, M.P. for West Down, who had for a number of years acted as one of the Conservative Whips, confirmed the report that he was retiring from Parliament. Captain Hill, a son of Lord Arthur, was the Unionist candidate for the vacant seat.

Mr. Thomas Owen, M.P. for the Launceston Division of Cornwall, met with a fatal accident near his residence in Wales. His body was found this morning in a pool of water, and it was supposed that he fell down a hillside and was drowned. Mr. Owen's majority at the last election was 658.

Tuesday, July 12.—The Imperial Postal Conference agreed upon the establishment of a penny post between Great Britain, Canada, Newfoundland, Cape Colony, Natal, and such Crown colonies as were willing to adopt it. It was not found possible to arrange for a reduced rate of postage throughout the Empire, and it was therefore left to each colony to make the arrangements which best suited it circumstances. It was stated that it might be assumed, from the attitude of the Postmaster-General of Bengal, that the Government of India would endorse the Canadian proposal.

Mr. A. H. D. Acland, M.P., announced to his constituents in the Rotherham Division of Yorkshire that he was compelled by ill-health to retire from Parliament. It would be difficult to exaggerate the magnitude of this loss to the party of progress. For, oddly enough, although Mr. Acland was a Liberal leader, he led.

No solution of the difficulties of the Spanish Cabinet was yet found. The Ministers still met, and their resignation was not considered final. There was little news from Santiago, except that General Shafter has again demanded the surrender of the town, sending a messenger with a flag of truce to point out to the besieged their hopeless position.

Wednesday, July 13.—The truce at Santiago was extended until noon to-morrow. Yellow fever broke out in the American lines. In Madrid the Ministerial crisis seemed for the present to have passed, and the Cabinet remained in office unaltered. The prevailing popular sentiment had changed during the last day or two and was now in favour of continuing the war. On the other hand, opinion in the Continental capitals inclined more and more to the belief that peace must now be sought by Spain. A Special Correspondent with the United States force in the Philippines telegraphed that Manila was not likely to surrender before being bombarded, and that German action was still regarded with suspicion. A German cruiser was said to have intervened last week, "in the cause of humanity," between the insurgents and the Spaniards.

The Anglo-American Committee met at Stafford House and decided to form an Anglo-American League. A resolution was passed advocating cordial and constant co-operation between Great Britain and the United States.

The South Wales Coalowners declined to recognise the position of Sir Edward Fry, the conciliator nominated by the Board of Trade, or to admit any intervention whatever between them and the men on strike. Sir Edward Fry met the men's representatives to-day, and it was decided that the latter should lay before the masters proposals upon which fresh negotiations might be opened without the aid of the conciliator.

Polling for the Parliamentary vacancy caused by the resignation of Colonel Dampier Palmer took place at Gravesend. Mr. Dudley Ryder, the Conservative candidate, managed to retain the seat, though by a greatly diminished majority. At the last election the excess of Tory over Liberal votes was 1,187. Mr. W. Runciman to-day reduced it to 371.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

THE "TRUE" AND THE "FALSE" RUPEE.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—I am glad that by printing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's letter to you side by side with the letter from myself, to which it is a reply, you have afforded your readers a convenient opportunity for judging, if they will, to what extent he has succeeded in removing or invalidating the objections which I had ventured to advance against the views previously expressed by him in the above matter.

With much deference to Mr. Naoroji, I feel that I need not here offer my own opinion on the point.—Yours, etc.,

Marpool, Exmouth, J. B. Phear.
July 9, 1898.

THE COMMITTEE ON CURRENCY.

OFFER OF INDIAN EVIDENCE DECLINED.

We printed in our issue of July 1 a letter addressed on June 25 by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, to the Indian Currency Committee, suggesting that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. W. Martin Wood, and Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt should be called as witnesses. The following reply has been received:

India Office, Whitehall, S.W.,
July 5, 1898.

Sir,—I have laid before the Indian Currency Committee your letter (undated) submitting, on behalf of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, the names of three gentlemen to give evidence on the subject of Indian currency.

In reply, I am to inform you that the list of witnesses to be examined before the prorogation of Parliament has been settled, and the Committee have not as yet arrived at any decision concerning the witnesses to be called after the recess. They will, however, be glad to accord their best consideration to any written communication which you may desire to lay before them.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Robert Chalmers, *Secretary*.

Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Our young contemporary, *British-Indian Commerce*, has interviewed Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the subject of the commerce of India, and published the results in its first (July) issue. "It is not my province," says the Special Commissioner, "to either review or pass judgment on Mr. Naoroji's policy, politics, or opinions, but it must be conceded to him that, being the first native Indian subject of the Queen to occupy a place in the Parliament of the Empire, both by his personality, his influence and his contributions to Parliamentary debate, he became an acknowledged representative of India, and quickened the curiosity of the ordinary British citizen in the affairs of India and its people.

"Your newspaper, *British-Indian Commerce*," Mr. Dadabhai was kind enough to say, "ought to help India immensely, and no doubt, as it is intended to be conducted, will do so. You are not a political paper, and although I am a politician on everything concerning India, I think we will find interesting subjects outside politics, albeit, I must confess to you, that from my point of view, the political policy of the Imperial Governments of all parties is answerable for a great deal of the commercial grievances of the people of India. The unnatural political condition is the whole difficulty."

"But let us define what is and what is not British-Indian trade," said Mr. Naoroji. "You are in the habit of believing at this side that everything of British and Irish produce exported to India is consumed in British India. That assumption is incorrect, and the truth is that a very large proportion of your trade with India is business done with the Native States. The people of these States are able to pay for foreign products; the inhabitants of British India proper are not in that enviable position."

"Why?" I enquired.

"Ah, the answer would lead us on to politics," replied Mr. Naoroji. "Will it not be better to give you some idea of what I mean by trade? It should be reciprocal and self-paying if it is true trade. India should have back as much as she gives in trade transactions. India receives from you goods to a certain value, and she pays you back in her own products. Only a

part of our exports, in fact, ought to pay for your imports to India, and the rest is all political 'bleeding.' And in the commerce, between India and this country, natural conditions are not maintained."

"You mean, I presume," said the Commissioner, "that there is a balance to the bad on one side."

"That is so," said the ex-Member for Finsbury, "but not my whole meaning. Briefly, I wish to give you my views on the facts. We will take the facts first. India does not produce any appreciable quantity of manufactures for export. The Indian people import foreign manufactured articles, chiefly yours. Well, the population of British India may be computed at 220 millions, leaving out the Native Independent States which are your best customers. You do not export to India of your produce as much in value as my country ought to be able to buy from you under better conditions than exist. Anticipating your visit I have here some comparative statistics on that subject," which, the Commissioner informed Mr. Naoroji, was particularly kind and considerate on his part. "These I had prepared from official statistics in 1887 to reply to Sir Grant Duff. Here are," continued Mr. Naoroji, "British exports to our North American Colonies amounting annually to thirty shillings and eightpence per head of the Canadian population. The exports to the Australias amount to 155 shillings per head of the Australasian population, and to Cape Colony they are worth forty-five shillings per head of the British South African population. Your exports to British India only amount to one and sixpence per head of our Indian fellow subjects. But that is not the whole case to be considered by the producers and manufacturers of the United Kingdom. They do not—because under the present system it is impossible—trade with India in anything like the proportion of their dealings with even European countries. Germany buys from the United Kingdom merchandise to the value of 7/3 per head of the population. France to the extent of eight shillings per head; Turkey in Europe sixteen shillings per head, and Russia one shilling per head, being partly supplied through intermediate countries. Outside Europe, the United States bought British goods worth eight and ninepence per head of the population, and every Egyptian subject spends ten shillings on the purchase of merchandise from the United Kingdom. And almost all these with protection against you."

"And the moral of your startling statistics, Mr. Naoroji?" I queried.

"The moral is plain enough, is it not?" was the reply. "If your Government in India by a just and truly English and not un-English and selfish policy had cultivated Indian resources for the benefit of India, as they always loudly profess, and aided its material progress, the people of India ought to be able to buy as much from you as either Canada or Australia. I mean as much per head of the population, and if that were the case, if British East India bought in the same proportion as Canada, she would absorb considerably more than the whole of the export trade from the United Kingdom. If in the same proportion as Australia she would consume nearly seven times as much as the whole of your exports amount to in value at present. Are these possibilities of trade to be neglected?" he asked, energetically.

In explanation of the remarkable disparity between Indian purchases of British goods and the investments of our Colonies and foreign countries in our merchandise, in spite of protection against us, Mr. Naoroji had much to say and many points to argue. We spent quite an hour in thrashing out this phase of the question under discussion. Mr. Naoroji contends that the people of India cannot purchase British goods, nor develop their own resources, because they are impoverished by the charges for our un-British and selfish system of governing India. To take one illustration which cropped up on a reference to the currency question, said Mr. Naoroji—"Say, in a rough way, on the average of ten years (1885-6 to 1895-6), the exports are Rx. 115,000,000. Take profits 10 per cent., so that exports and profits are about Rx. 126,000,000, which must be the imports in real and natural trade. But the average of the imports of same 10 years is only Rx. 85,000,000, leaving a difference of some Rx. 40,000,000. Where is that gone if not to this country? An ocean even will dry up if its evaporation did not return to it by river and rain. Is not that a killing drain? or, as Lord Salisbury calls it, 'bleeding.' The deficit represents the profit you make on this side, which impoverishes us. How could we find money for the promotion of industries of our own under such circumstances or buy your goods? In fact, the British inhabitants of India and your exporters to India prosper to a degree, but the natives of India suffer. As I have said, much of the goods imported go to the Native States, some is for the Anglo-Indian population. The natives of British India are not buyers, because they have not the wherewithal to pay."

"They pay very dearly for what goods they receive from you already," he continued. "As I have said, the value per head of the British and Irish merchandise bought by India is computed at this side at not more than 1/6 per head of the population. That is the real trade which you have with the Natives. This element in their poverty," said Mr. Naoroji, "is the great drain of the civil and military charges. The United Kingdom governs India, but the Indian pays for the Government, a cruel and crushing cost, as Sir George Wingate says. Every penny of that, with the profits of trade, the usual mercantile charges, etc., goes into the pockets of the stranger. In rough numbers it is calculated that at least two hundred million rupees a year —I consider a great deal more—are drawn from India. If that amount or the greater portion of it remained in the country and was used in industries and commerce, India would be universally and immensely larger customers for British goods than at present. She could consume far more than you could supply."

"Just now," I reminded my host, "the currency question is a burning one in India, is it not?"

"Well, it is the question of the moment," he answered; "but I do not regard the influence on commerce as very material."

"The whole foundation of the proposals of the Government of India is unsound. If the Government of India do not return to a rational state of mind, and persist in their present mistaken course, even after the experienee of much mischief, far greater mischief, both commercial and political, is in store."

"The Currency Committee has to give careful consideration to the taxpayers' poverty and point of view, and if my humble evidence can be of any service I am quite willing to give it, as I gave it on being invited in 1893."

PLAGUE MEASURES IN BOMBAY.

CONVICTION OF AN ENGLISH SOLDIER FOR CRIMINAL ASSAULT.

We take the following report from the *Bombay Gazette* of June 18:—

At the Mazagon Police Court yesterday Mr. W. Webb, acting second Presidency magistrate, disposed of a case in which two gunners of the Royal Artillery, named Richardson, No. 89,886, and Battraby, No. 59,981, appeared to answer summonses taken out against them by one Dewoobai, a Hindu woman residing at Girgaum, charging them with assaulting her with intent to outrage her modesty, under section 354 of the Indian Penal Code, and with insult, under section 504 of the same Code, on the evening of March 5 last. Mr. L. P. de Souza, pleader, appeared for the prosecutrix, while the accused conducted their own defence.

The information was originally filed before Mr. W. R. Hamilton, second Presidency magistrate, who, before issuing the summonses against the accused, referred the matter to Mr. Du Boulay's Grievance Committee at the Town Hall for investigation. Mr. Du Boulay returned the matter to the magistrate, stating that he could not interfere until the complaint was withdrawn from the Police Court. The prosecutrix refused to withdraw the complaint, and the magistrate had to issue the summonses against the accused, and the case came on for hearing before Mr. Webb, who acts for Mr. Hamilton.

The prosecutrix, in her information, stated that about five o'clock on the afternoon of March 5 last she went to the house of one Bhasker Purshotum, to see her daughter, who lived there. About three-quarters of an hour after, while she was with her daughter, the accused, whom she had ascertained from the plague camp at Marine Service Lines to be gunners, came to the house and felt the pulse of the said Bhasker Purshotum, who was seated in the verandah. They then entered the house and examined a little boy, son of the said Bhasker, by stripping him of his clothes. After that they proceeded to close the front and rear doors of the house, and then went upstairs, followed by Bhasker. The prosecutrix stated that she was on the second floor, but when the accused came up she was going downstairs along with the other females. The soldiers, however, seized her by the hand and forced her into a room close to the diwankhana, where there was no one besides Bhasker and her brother-in-law, Wamon, and closed the door. They then took her near a window and felt her pulse all over; after which they took her to a bed and made her lie down on her back, and further examined her at the armpits and groins. Bhasker and Wamon strongly objected to what the accused were doing, but in vain. The accused then asked the prosecutrix to bring the other women of the house to be examined, but Bhasker told them to bring female doctors for that purpose. The soldiers sat on a box, and insisted upon remaining in the house. In the meantime Bhasker went and brought two policemen. The soldiers went up to the policemen, and they were eventually taken away from the house. Under these circumstances, Dewoobai charged gunners Richardson and Battraby with insult with the view of outraging her modesty, and prayed for summonses against them, and that they might be dealt with according to law.

The prosecutrix was examined by Mr. de Souza, and gave evidence similar to the allegation in the information. After some corroborative evidence was recorded on behalf of the prosecutrix, Inspector Sloane was examined by Mr. de Souza. Mr. Sloane stated that the accused were brought to him by several Hindus, who complained that they had entered their houses. The accused, on being questioned by Mr. Sloane,

said that they had been acting under the orders of the Plague Committee.

After recording the evidence adduced on behalf of the prosecution, the magistrate framed the charges against the first accused, Richardson, discharging the second accused, Battraby, for want of sufficient evidence against him. Richardson, on being questioned by the Court, said that a boy took him to the house of the complainant, saying that it was a house of ill-fame. Richardson thereupon went into the house, but finding that respectable persons resided therein he at once left it.

His Worship, in disposing of the case, remarked that the evidence against the accused was clear. Accused entered into the house of a respectable person, and several witnesses had corroborated the complainant's statement. Inspector Sloane said that the accused stated to him that they were under orders of the Plague Committee, and that evidence corroborated the complainant's story. The accused Richardson was sentenced to four months' rigorous imprisonment.

DR. MULLICK AT THE PIONEER CLUB.

A Correspondent writes:—The members of the Pioneer Club—the "premier" ladies' club in London—entertained Dr. Sarat Mullick as the guest of the evening at a dinner on July 7. Subsequently he opened a discussion at a large meeting of the members, presided over by the Hon. Mrs. Arthur Pelham. The subject for the evening was:—"That it is a question whether our Government is morally bound to combat the plague in India against native convictions, religious and social."

In the course of his speech Dr. Mullick said there was no reason why it should be taken for granted, as the motion implied, that the actual measures necessary for stamping out plague were opposed to the religious or social convictions of the people. The measures taken were, briefly, segregation, inoculation, and disinfection. Segregation—known as "home segregation"—was nothing new to the Indian people. Inoculation had been known and practised in India from time immemorial, and indeed spread as a science from the East to the West. Disinfection, though not always with the modern therapeutic agents, was religiously practised night and morning in every Indian household. In principle, therefore, there was nothing new in the steps now so vigorously taken. He was convinced that much of the recent disturbance was due to the machinery adopted for enforcing those principles. The high-handedness of search parties who allowed their zeal to outrun their discretion; the disregard of Indian customs, springing from ignorance of the ways of the people; insufficiency of Indian representation, together with the wild stories set afloat by busybodies who had a finger in every pie, were, he thought, some of the causes of the troubles which had occurred. The incarceration without trial of the Natu brothers was contrary to the elementary principles of British justice, which was the sheet-anchor of British supremacy in India. He was glad the Government had adopted to a large extent the very measures which the Natu brothers had advocated. It was no light blow to the authority of a Government if it contemptuously disregarded counsels which were constitutionally tendered and afterwards gave way before the fury of an enraged mob. (Cheers.) He believed that the more the Government took the people into its confidence the better it would be for all. He advocated the formation of an independent committee for hearing complaints against the search parties, and another for verifying suspected cases. It was said that in the present panic everything — even child-birth — was considered plague. By printing and widely circulating their intentions the authorities would greatly diminish the occupation of mischief-makers who fattened upon riot and pillage. The institution of Ward Vigilance Committees, the payment of full compensation for properties destroyed, the founding of caste hospitals, home segregation of the afflicted, and the segregation of the healthy members of an infected area for observation, were, he thought, some of the remedial measures which might with advantage be adopted. He hoped the ladies of England would continue in their efforts to ameliorate the condition of their fellow-subjects in India, for he was sure that drawing-room influence played no little part in moulding the destinies of their great Empire. (Laughter and cheers.)

In the discussion which followed, Dr. Marion Hunter stated that with sympathy and tact she had been able to allay the natural disinclination of Indians to part with a dear relative. She narrated her experiences in Poona, where she was sent by the Government. When once the people were convinced that the "doctor mem-sahib" wished to do good to their relatives, they had readily responded to her desires. She condemned the sanitary condition of the country, and desired better understanding between the rulers and the ruled. (Cheers.)

Lady Anna Stapleton agreed with the opener of the discussion that besides the microbic cause there was an economic cause of plague. It was their duty to see that the Indian received fair play. (Cheers.)

The discussion was continued by several ladies and gentlemen, at whose hands the Government received vigorous treatment.

"INDIA OFFICE SUPERLATIVES."

Under this heading the quasi-official *Pioneer* of Allahabad printed in its issue of June 17 the following article which, remarkable as it is, is nevertheless a fair sample of the criticism provoked in the Anglo-Indian Press by Lord G. Hamilton's incorrigible optimism:—

As the *Times* has put it, Lord George Hamilton, in asking the House of Commons to sanction the new Indian sterling loan of ten millions, took the bull by the horns, and, to judge from the accounts sent by Reuter, and by our own correspondent, he has not been tossed for his audacity. There are two inferences possible from such an encounter; one, which the London Press have apparently accepted, is very complimentary to the Secretary of State; the other, which we should be inclined to prefer, is uncomplimentary to the bull. That animal must have been a very poor creature, with no horns to speak of, and no eye for the unguarded parts of the official anatomy, or the Secretary of State would have fared badly. To drop metaphor, the Secretary of State's remarks on Indian finance and Indian administration generally are couched in a vein of extravagant optimism; and looking at the situation in India as a whole, this is certainly not the tone which a statesman should adopt. The translation of *mens æqua in arduis* is not overweening confidence amidst difficulties which require not only courage and resolution, but prudence and foresight, if they are to be successfully overcome. Sir James Westland made as good an apology for the Indian finance of the last five years in his Budget Statement, and his subsequent speech in the course of the debate in the Imperial Council, as the Secretary of State is likely to have made. And what did it amount to? The Finance member made a great flourish with a survey of the accounts for the last twenty years, which showed that, taking one year with another, and setting deficits against surpluses, we emerge with a balance on the right side of something over three crores of rupees. On this we pointed out at the time—(1) that the balance would disappear altogether if we set against it the five millions sterling contributed by England at the time of the Afghan war, which we are entitled to do if we accept Sir James Westland's contention that India should never accept a subsidy from England; and (2) that in the survey no account was taken of the taxation imposed in the course of the twenty years. The Finance Minister ignored the first point in his speech in the Budget debate; but he took up the second, pointing out that in some cases, as with the import duties, taxes existing at the beginning of the period had been reimposed, or when there was an enhancement of a tax, as in the case of salt, the total impost was still less than it was twenty years ago. This explanation did not cover the objection, for the income tax and the petroleum tax were entirely new imposts; but even if the taxes now existing were the same as those existing in 1878, the suggestion that the finances of the country are as healthy now as they were then, will not bear a moment's examination.

In the first place the increment from the expansion of the chief heads of revenue—land, salt, excise, customs—has been used up, not only without a reduction of taxation, but without providing for the urgent needs of internal administration. As Mr. Allan Arthur once observed in the Imperial Council, "Anyone who possesses a large and fertile estate, unencumbered by excessive debt, can usually make both ends meet, though his personal expenditure may be lavish and his expenditure on the estate and improvements niggardly and ill-directed." The Imperial Budget, it is notorious, has of late years been balanced only by dint of extorting benevolences from the provinces at the expense of good administration. To quote another Member of Council: "The case of Ministerial officers has always seemed to me to be in the main very hard for them and injurious to the interests of Government. . . . . Salaries were for the most part fixed long ago; but while they have remained practically constant the expense of living has been gradually and steadily rising, so that the standard either of living or of honest service must have of necessity fallen. . . . . Considering the dangers, the responsibilities, the powers, the temptations which are inseparable from police work, the officers of that department, especially those in the lowest grades, are most inadequately paid." The result of this compulsory niggardliness on the part of Government is seen in an emergency like that caused by the plague; the lower ranks of Ministerial officers seizing the opportunity to fill their pockets by oppressing the people and spreading all manner of injurious reports regarding the intentions of the Government. Provincial public works of all kinds have similarly been starved: economy being pushed to such pitiful lengths as we had occasion recently to notice in connection with the gaol at Naini, where a roof which had been repeatedly condemned was left from year to year on the plea of want of funds. In other words, Government has been able to balance its accounts, even after imposing all the taxation deemed prudent, only by declining or postponing expenditure necessary to keep its estate in proper order. This no doubt is a resort to which all Governments may be driven at a pinch, but of late years with

the Government of India what may be excusable as a makeshift has become a method, although a foreign Government, circumstanced as ours is, is the last that can venture on such an experiment with a light heart. It may be said, of course, that in the years to come all this will be set right from the funds available through the normal growth in revenue: but it is extremely doubtful whether the increment from the expanding heads of revenue, will be as great in the next decade, as it has been in the last ten years, and even in that event the chances are that much of the increase will be neutralised by the steady decline of the opium revenue. In any case, if our statesmen set out with the comfortable belief which seems to possess Lord George Hamilton, that if we only go on as we have been doing, we shall do excellently, it is clear that the receipts from the normal increase in the revenue will continue to be spent without a rupee being allotted to remedy the defects we have pointed out. Then there is the question of the currency, for which Sir James Westland is more directly responsible. Lord George Hamilton is reported to have said that one of the legacies Lord Elgin would bequeath to his successor would be a sound system of finance. If under the term finance we are to include currency, this observation is ridiculous. It is admitted on all hands that the present system of currency is obnoxious to the most serious objections, to which, nevertheless, the Viceroy and the Finance Member never awoke until a few months ago; it is admitted also, if not on all hands, at least by a vast majority, that the proposals now at length put forward by way of remedy by the Government are equally, if not more, objectionable. Possibly the Currency Committee may devise other means for mitigatieg the defects of the existing system; but if so no thanks will be due to the Government, and it will be time enough to cry *eureka* when the panacea has been found.

As to the Secretary of State's remarks on Lord Elgin's administration generally, everyone who has kept in touch with the history of the last five years, will ungrudgingly testify to the courage and resolution which Lord Elgin has exhibited in the face of extraordinary difficulties, and to the high ideal of public duty he has realised in his own office and has consistently set before his colleagues. To say so much is to say a great deal, and when no more was needed Lord Elgin's administration has been beyond praise. In the famine, for instance, the obligation that lay upon the Viceroy was heavy, but it was clear, and the means to be taken in meeting it were obvious, though their employment involved a tremendous strain both upon the resources of the Government and the energies of its officers. Nothing could be more admirable than the steady courage with which Lord Elgin faced the emergency, nothing more praiseworthy than the unfailing encouragement and support he gave to provincial Governments. But lofty purpose and steady devotion to duty are not the only qualifications necessary for the successful discharge of the duties of the Viceroy of India. Experience in public affairs, judgment, foresight — all the qualities that point the way unerringly when more than one course lies open, and more than one plan is advocated in the settlement of great questions of State—these also are indispensable. At the time when he left home to assume the Viceroyalty, Lord Elgin's experience of public life had been almost entirely parochial; of Indian affairs he had no knowledge whatever; and he has had the additional misfortune of an unusually weak Council during the greater part of his tenure of office. Yet, as soon as he landed, he was called upon to take up a decisive attitude in regard to the settlement of great lines of policy—the right of India to raise taxes in the manner India thinks best, the merit of a policy of absorption or non-interference on the frontier, the best means of placing the currency of India upon a sound basis. If the Secretary of State and the British public go away from a survey of the last five years with the idea that experiments of this kind can be tried with impunity, they will miss the main lesson of Lord Elgin's rule. Had a statesman versed in public affairs been placed at the helm five years ago, we might not now be seeking a way out of the difficulties into which a wrong turning in North-West frontier policy has landed us: we might be further on the way towards a solution of the currency problem than the submission of proposals which have excited general ridicule; we should not have entered on a railway policy for which the resources of the country were inadequate; and we might by this time have come to form some settled and satisfactory plan as to how, in a country like India, such an emergency as the outbreak of plague ought to be treated. The next few years in India will be in many respects critical; they will task the abilities of the most experienced and capable statesman England can send out; but there is small chance that these truths will be given their due weight in England if the Secretary of State's sketch of the results of Lord Elgin's Viceroyalty is accepted without the addition of a good deal of shading.

Although India is not mentioned in the Postmaster-General's announcement concerning the scheme of Imperial Penny Postage, approved by the Westminster Palace Hotel Conference, it may (the *Times* says) be assumed, from the attitude of the Postmaster-General of Bengal, who represented our great Asiatic dependency at the gathering, that the Viceregal Council will heartily endorse the Canadian proposal.

Imperial Parliament.

Monday, July 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions from Congresbury, Bristol, Whitby, and Reigate, against State regulation; to lie upon the Table.

SEPOY MUTINY VETERANS.

Mr. M'Laren asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether he was aware that large numbers of old soldiers who served in the Crimean War and Indian Mutiny were living in the receipt of parish relief, or in very poor circumstances, in Leicestershire and other parts of the country:

Whether all these men over sixty-five years of age were to be considered under the new arrangement between the War Office and the Treasury as candidates qualified to receive the special grant, as well as any under that age who had been certified by an Army Medical Officer to be totally incapacitated by bodily infirmity from earning a living:

And, whether any minimum number of years' service was necessary to qualify an old soldier for a compassionate allowance.

Mr. Powell Williams: I am not aware of the facts as stated in the first paragraph. The conditions of the grant of compassionate campaign pensions referred to in the second paragraph are accurately stated, and a further condition is a minimum of ten years' colour service; 3,194 have already been relieved under this power.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE. THE DRAFT REPORT.

Mr. Herbert Lewis asked the First Lord of the Treasury, if he was aware that it was now more than twelve months since the evidence before the Indian Expenditure Commission was finally closed, and that no draft report had yet been submitted by the chairman to the members of the Commission:

And, was there any prospect of the Report being issued in time for the Budget discussion in the Session of 1899.

Mr. Balfour: The chairman of the Commission, Lord Welby, informs me that he has not yet been able to complete the draft report; but that he intends to submit to the Commission the first part in a few days, and hopes to complete it before the recess.

Tuesday, July 12.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation; from Bristol (three), Bath, Talgarth, and Widcombe; to lie upon the Table.

RETURN OF LOANS RAISED IN INDIA.

East India (Loans raised in India),—Copy presented—of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 31st March, 1898, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 294.]

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India, whether those officers in the Indian Civil Service whose allowance for exchange compensation was stopped in 1894, and who, under the new rules, have been admitted to the allowance from April 1, 1897, were now permitted to draw arrears for the period from 1894 to 1897, during which it was stopped pending the decision of the Secretary of State.

Lord G. Hamilton: Orders have been given by the Government of India for the classification of the cases in which exchange compensation to civil officers was suspended in 1894 and is admissible under the new rules of 1897, with a view to a decision being passed in each case whether the arrears for the intervening three years may be granted. In a few cases, where the claim has been considered to be clearly established, such arrears have been paid.

THE WAR BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

Mr. Beckett asked the Secretary of State for India whether full investigation had been made departmentally into the causes that led to the outbreak on the Indian frontier, and particularly into the relations which prevailed before the rising between the various frontier officers and officials and the tribes with which they were in contact:

Whether the India Office had carefully considered the recommendations and suggestions, with a view to an amended system of control, which had been made since the termination of the war by those who were engaged in it, or who by reason of special local experience of the tribes were best qualified to express an opinion:

And, whether the recommendation that the entire frontier should be placed under a distinct and separate administration would be carried into effect by the Indian Government, or did they propose to make any change in that direction.

Lord G. Hamilton: In paragraph 10 of my despatch to the Government of India, dated January 28 last, I entered into a full consideration of the causes which led to the outbreak on the Indian frontier. I further enlarged upon the same subject in a speech which I addressed to this House, and I have nothing further to add.

The matters referred to in the second and third paragraphs of the hon. member's question are at present the subject of correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India, and I am not at present in a position to make any statement of my conclusions.

OFFICERS' PASSAGE MONEY.

General Russell asked the Secretary of State for India whether

the Indian Government had come to any decision as regards refunding their passage money to those officers who were suddenly ordered out to India on the outbreak of hostilities last year:

And, whether it had been fully represented that those officers, many of whom had been only a few days in England, not only sacrificed their leave, but were put to great expense which they could ill afford.

Lord G. Hamilton: The hon. and gallant member is no doubt aware that all officers who were ordered out to India on the outbreak of hostilities by the proper authorities received their passage money as a matter of course. His question, therefore, must relate to those officers who returned to India on that occasion, though not summoned by the Indian Government. As to these cases I addressed the Viceroy in a despatch dated the April 21, and I have ascertained that the matter is still under the consideration of his Government, and that a reply will be sent as soon as possible.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

Mr. James Stuart asked the Secretary of State for India, whether a letter had been issued under date November 20, 1897, by the Government of India, Military Department, purporting to state explicitly the policy of the Government of India with respect to the future treatment of venereal disease in cantonments, stating that among other things medical officers might make arrangements to carry out from time to time the examination of women who voluntarily presented themselves:

And, whether the statement of policy made in that letter had been sanctioned by him.

Lord G. Hamilton: The instructions issued by the Government of India in the letter to which the hon. member refers are based on my despatch No. 25, of March 26, 1897, which has been presented to Parliament, and I see no reason to question their propriety.

Mr. Stuart: Will the noble lord lay the paper on the table?

Lord G. Hamilton: I will lay any regulation I have.

Major Rasch: Will the noble lord consider the advisability of making this examination compulsory?

Lord G. Hamilton: That does not arise out of this question.

THE PLAGUE AT POONA.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the municipality had been assessed by the Accountant General with four lakhs of rupees as its share of the plague expenditure up to June 1, 1898, and whether another lakh was added as the estimated further expenditure:

Whether he was aware that the Poona municipality had no cash balance with which to meet that apportionment, and that the collector of Poona was urging the municipality to raise a loan of five lakhs:

Whether he could state whether the punitive police force, placed upon Poona at the time of the murder of Messrs. Rand and Ayerst, was still there, and what had been the total cost of that force to Poona from its imposition to the present time:

And, whether, in view of the financial difficulties of the municipality of Poona, and that no evidence whatever was forthcoming at the trial of Damodar for the murders connecting the municipality with their inception, he would order the removal of the punitive force and remit the cost to the municipality.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have no information as to the share of the plague expenditure which has been assessed on the municipality of Poona, nor as to the cash balance at present available. With regard to the cost of the additional police I have repeatedly stated its estimated amount; the actual amount is probably less, but I am not in a position to give particulars. At the recent trial the question whether there had been a conspiracy was not investigated; there was but one prisoner, and the only evidence adduced was directed to show that he had committed the murders. The absence of evidence implicating others does not therefore seem to be a sound ground for ordering the withdrawal of the additional force.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS.

Captain Norton asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state if Indian Staff Corps Officers were frequently promoted to higher rank without having passed the prescribed examination, whereas in the case of officers serving in British regiments that rarely took place;

And, whether he would consider the advisability of placing both classes of officers upon an equality in that respect.

Lord G. Hamilton: The system of examinations in the Indian Staff Corps differs materially from that which prevails in the British army, inasmuch as there are, in the Staff Corps, no examinations for promotion from rank to rank, but only for the various regimental, staff, and departmental appointments. The comparison, therefore, which is implied in the honourable and gallant member's question cannot properly be made.

Wednesday, July 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases), —Petitions against State regulation; from Bristol, Bathwick, Glasgow, Clifton, and Barton Hill; to lie upon the Table.

INDIA OFFICE (STORE DEPOT) BILL.

The India Office (Store Depôt) Bill was reported from the Select Committee, with amendments. The Report was ordered to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

The Bill was re-committed to a Committee of the whole House for to-morrow.

Thursday, July 14.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

GALLANT CONDUCT OF A LIEUT.-SURGEON.

Sir Walter Foster asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the gallant conduct of Surgeon-Lieutenant V. Hugo, of the Malakand Field Force, under the following circumstances:—Lieutenant Ford was dangerously wounded in the shoulder, and was bleeding to death from the bullet having cut the main artery, when Surgeon-Lieutenant Hugo came to his aid. The fire was too hot to permit lights to be used to examine the wound, and there was no cover, nevertheless the surgeon struck a match and examined the wound. The match went out amid a splutter of bullets, which kicked up the dust all round; but by its uncertain light he saw the nature of the injury, and seized the bleeding artery, and as no ligature was available he remained for three hours under fire, holding the vessel between his finger and thumb. When at length it seemed that the enemy had broken into camp he picked up the officer, who was unconscious from loss of blood, and bore him into a place of safety without relaxing his hold of the artery:

And, whether the authorities had taken steps to reward suitably this splendid act of devotion.

Lord G. Hamilton: The officer who performed the gallant action referred to by the hon. member was Surgeon-Lieut. J. H. Hugo, who for his services in the late campaign has received the decoration of the Distinguished Service Order.

THE HOSPITAL AT ADEN.

Mr. Moon asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any English nurses had been engaged for the hospital at Aden:

And, whether the Government of India or the Admiralty would pay their salaries.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am not aware whether any English nurses have yet been engaged for the Aden hospital, but am in communication with the Government of India on this subject, as also regarding the proportion of their salaries to be paid by the Admiralty and Port funds respectively. The latter point to a large extent regulates the class of nurses to be engaged.

Mr. Herbert Roberts (on going into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts)—To move: That, in the opinion of this House, the recent alterations made in the Law relating to sedition and the control of the Press in India, being a distinct departure from the traditional policy of the Indian Government in regard to the Press and to public criticism, demand the immediate attention of Parliament; and that, having regard to the conditions of British rule in India and to the exceptional part played by the Indian Press as the only medium for expressing the opinion of the people as to Government measures, and to the fact that such a policy of restriction and intimidation must, if persisted in, result in producing elements of danger to the Government of India, it is desirable that the legislation in question should be repealed at the earliest opportunity.

ET CAETERA.

We understand that the Report of the Indian Famine Commission, of which Sir James Lyall is Chairman, is expected to be concluded in September next.

It is announced that the Viceroy of India intends to visit Burma in November.

The "Carthage," from Bombay for London, left Port Said on Wednesday evening with the Indian mail.

The P. and O. s.s. "Palawan" leaves London, for Calcutta, on July 15. Her list of passengers includes the following names:—Mr. S. C. Mabalanobis, Major G. A. Penthys-Evans, Dr. P. Hughes, Mr. A. Dingwall, Mr. C. A. Maynard, Mr. E. Wellstead, Lieut. R. Morrisay, and Mr. P. and Miss de Clermont.

The s.s. "Caledonia" (P. and O.), for Bombay, leaves London on July 21, with the following among other passengers: Major Munsell, Major Williams, Lieut.-Col. B. Masters, Major and Mrs. E. L. Wright, Colonel B. A. Vincent, Capt. M. H. Orr, Colonel C. C. Rich, and Surg.-Capt. T. E. Dyson.

The P. and O. s.s. "Malta" arrived in London, from Calcutta, on July 9. Her list of passengers includes the following names:—Mr. W. Gunisiavan, Capt. V. Spalding, Capt. G. Carson, Mr. E. Gamath, The Hon. and Mrs. Girdon, General and Mrs. Clerk, Mr. B. Abela, and Capt. and Mrs. Trinandaye.

Mr. Arthur N. Wollaston, C.I.E., has been appointed Registrar and Superintendent of Records at the India Office, in place of Mr. F. C. Danvers, who retires.

Mr. John E. Ferard has been appointed Private Secretary to Sir Arthur Godley, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for India, in place of Mr. Francis C. Drake, promoted.

Mr. F. Arthur Hirtzel has been appointed Private Secretary to the Earl of Onslow, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, in place of Mr. Ferard.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1897):
HON. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
W. C. BONNERJEE.
A. M. BOSE.
W. S. CAINE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
H. S. KHALIL.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 11, Clive Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur	Muzaffarpur District	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the Name of Sub-division.	*N. W. P. for the purpose of distributing* "INDIA." Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapur District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
29. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Districts	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District [Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
37. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
38. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
39. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
40. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
41. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "INDIA."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; JRISHA RAM, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,
SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTERS NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d. **NERVINE**

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), **8/6**, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails t Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.

Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all th English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in th Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE

"HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR

INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months ...	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year ...	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 56, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE.

An Episode of Frontier War.

BY

WINSTON L. SPENCER CHURCHILL,
Lieutenant, the 4th Queen's Own Hussars.

With Maps, Plans, etc.
Crown 8vo. **7s. 6d.**

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.